



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/733,788

12/10/2003

Mehmet Yunt

MWS-106RCE

8974

74321

7590

08/13/2008

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP/THE MATHWORKS
FLOOR 30, SUITE 3000
One Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109-2127

EXAMINER

SILVER, DAVID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2128

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/13/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Art Unit: 2128

Continuation of previous section:

Objection to claim 71 withdrawn in view of amendment.

Rejection of claim 10 (35 U.S.C. § 112) withdrawn in view of cancellation.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 70 and 71 is withdrawn in view of Applicants' remarks (page 18 bottom to page 19 top).

Applicants arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection have been fully considered but are unpersuasive for the following reasons. Applicants are arguing features which are broader than claimed. Specifically, the claim merely requires indicating the order of execution of said plurality of execution methods for said block. The "for said block" is broad, and as such, it is believed that Applicants intend to claim (based on the arguments), indication the order of execution within said block of said plurality of execution methods for said block. The "for said block" is merely a possessive term, which means that the execution methods belong to the said block, and not that the order of execution is indicated such that the information contains the order of execution within the block. Meaning, by indicating the order of execution of the blocks, inherently indicates an order of execution of the methods within the block, but not necessarily the order of the methods themselves within the said block.

Arguments regarding start / stop time (Remarks: page 21 bottom) are similarly unpersuasive for the reasons set-forth *supra*.

Remarks, section B.1, are unpersuasive for the reasons set-forth above.

Remarks, section B.2, are unpersuasive because Applicants argue features not claimed. Specifically, claim recites that an error is identified as being in the first or second method. It is not claimed that the error is being identified as being in either the first or the second. By indicating that an error occurs within a block having only a first and a second method, the indication inherently identifies that the first or second method has the error.

Remarks, section B.4, are unpersuasive because Applicants are argued features which were given the broadest and most reasonable interpretation consistent with the Specification.

"There is nothing in either MathWorks or the present Application that states, implicitly or explicitly, that blocks are "merely a group of methods." Applicants note, in the Application at page 3, that blocks "contain a collection of methods that are invoked by the execution engine at certain times during the simulation for different purposes." While blocks may "contain" a collection of methods, it is not accurate to suggest that blocks and methods are "functionally equivalent." For example, a block may contain, in addition to a collection of methods, data, state information, or an iconic representation (see, e.g., Application at page 14-15)." **(Remarks: page 28)**

Applicants are arguing features which are not necessitated by the claims. Specifically, the addition of collection of methods, data, state information, or an iconic representation is not claimed. Accordingly, given its most reasonable interpretation, these features are not required, nor necessitated, and therefore not given patentable weight. Therefore, the two features (methods and blocks) are indeed functionally equivalent as claimed.

Remarks, sections B.5 and B.6 are unpersuasive for the reasons set-forth above.

Remarks, section C is unpersuasive for the reasons set-forth regarding claim 1.

Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections have been maintained.

Applicants' remarks have been fully considered and are partially persuasive, as explained above.

However, the Application, as claimed, is not in condition for allowance at this time.